

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-17 were pending. Claim 1-17 were rejected, and Claims 8 was objected to. In this paper, Claim 1, 3-6, 11, and 12 are amended, Claim 17 is cancelled and new Claims 18-24 are added. Claims 1-16 and 18-24 are current pending. No new matter has been added. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, and 5-10

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kong et al. (USPN 6,242,973). It is respectfully submitted that the amendment to Claim 1 renders the rejection to Claims 1, 2, and 5-10 moot.

Claim 1 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because Kong does not disclose, “a source-to-gate voltage of the p-type transistor is greater than a mid-supply voltage of the logic circuit, and the gate-to-source voltage of the n-type transistor is greater than the mid-supply voltage”, as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1 as amended.

Claims 2 and 5-10 are respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because they depend on Claim 1, which is proposed to be allowable.

Claims 3, 4, and 12

The rejections to Claim 3, 4, and 12 are respectfully traversed. Claims 3 and 12 have been re-written in independent form. Claim 4 depends from Claim 3.

Claim 3 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because Kong does not disclose “the voltage offset circuit includes a resistor circuit”, as recited in Applicant’s Claim 3.

The Office Action stated, “With respect to Claim 3, the definition of the term “resistor” includes “A device used to control current in an electric circuit by providing resistance” (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, 2000). Almost every component in a circuit provides a resistance that limits current, therefore it is reasonable to interpret capacitors Cp and Cn, or even any of the transistors in circuit 10 of Fig. 2 as resistors.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The dictionary definition quoted by the Office Action does not attempt to set out necessary and sufficient conditions of a resistor. It is correct that a resistor is a device that may be used to control current in an electric circuit by providing resistance. However, this dictionary definition should not be interpreted to mean that all devices with this property are resistors. The definition is intended to give a layman some idea of what a resistor is, and state properties of the resistor to explain what it is, even though other devices which are not resistors may share the same properties.

The plain and ordinary meaning of the word “resistor”, as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, is such that a capacitor is not a resistor. See, for example, http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/~www_pa/Scots_Guide/info/comp/passive/resistor/resistor.htm, which states, “A resistor is a piece of material that obeys Ohm’s Law.” It is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that a capacitor is not a resistor, and that, generally speaking, a transistor is not a resistor. However, it is known that transistor can be biased as a resistor, for example, a MOSFET transistor that is biased in a linear region of operation operates as a resistor with a resistance proportional to its gate drive.

Further, a capacitor fails to even meet the definition quoted in the Office Action because a capacitor provides capacitance, not resistance. The term “impedance” is inclusive of resistance, capacitance, and inductance; however, “resistance” is distinct from “capacitance”. An “ideal” capacitor has capacitance but no resistance. A “real” capacitor has a relatively small parasitic resistance; however, this does not mean that a capacitor is a resistor.

Claim 12 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least for reasons similar to those stated above. Claim 4 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because it depends on Claim 3.

Claims 11 and 13-16

It is respectfully submitted that the amendment to Claim 11 renders the rejection to Claims 11 and 13-16 moot.

Claim 11 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because Kong does not disclose, “a timer circuit that is arranged such that, when the timing circuit is activated, an output voltage is asserted after a pre-determined threshold time plus the propagation delay”.

Claims 13-16 are respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because they depend on Claim 11, which is proposed to be allowable.

New Claims 18-24

Claim 18 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because Kong does not disclose, “the positive offset is less than the difference between the high power supply and the low power supply”, as recited in Applicants’ Claim 18.

Claim 19 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because Kong does not disclose “the logic circuit performs as if the difference between the high power supply and the low power supply was greater than the actual difference between the high power supply and the low power supply”, as recited in Applicant’s Claim 19. Claims 20-22 are respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because they depend on Claim 19.

Claim 23 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because Kong does not disclose “a current mirror”, as recited in Applicant’s Claim 23.


Claim 24 is respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because Kong does not disclose “regardless of the logic level at the gate of the p-type transistor, the capacitor circuit is coupled between the gate of the p-type transistor and the second node”, as recited in Applicant’s Claim 24.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-16 and 18-24) are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentably distinct. Applicants reserve the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: August 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Matthew M. Gaffney

Registration No.: 46,717

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Customer No.: 38845